DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 120 918 80 EA 008 055

AUTHOR Gubb, Natalie
TITLE Alternatives in Education. Issue Paper.
INSTITUTION Upper Atlantic Regional Interstate Project, Trenton, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of State Agency Cooperation.
PUB DATE Mar 75
NOTE 50p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Alternative Schools; *Educational Alternatives; Educational Innovation; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Experimental Programs; Policy Formation; Program Development; *State Departments of Education; *State School District Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title V; ESEA Title V

ABSTRACT

This publication is intended primarily to aid state departments of education in formulating a state policy regarding alternative approaches in education. Section 1 defines and describes public and private educational alternatives and addresses the questions of why and for whom educational alternatives are created. In addition, it discusses the types of problems and costs that are typically encountered by alternative programs. Section 2 identifies four different positions that a state education agency might adopt toward educational alternatives and then discusses the policy implications of each position. The four positions that are examined include (1) encouraging the growth of alternatives by actively soliciting legislative, financial, and community support; (2) supporting local alternative programs by offering technical assistance and disseminating useful information; (3) maintaining an attitude of ambivalence; and (4) discouraging the growth of alternatives by creating regulations that impede their development. Included in the appendix are short descriptions of 24 alternative educational programs in New Jersey and a copy of the Connecticut State Department of Education's policy on the development of educational alternatives. (Author/JG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED120914

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ISSUE PAPER

ON

ALTERNATIVES IN EDUCATION

by Natalie Gubb

Edited by Gary Natriello and Thomas J. Venables

Prepared For:

The Upper Atlantic Regional Interstate Project

With Funds from ESEA, Title V, Section 505

A Project of the:

Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation

Gary Gappert, Assistant Commissioner

State Coordinators:

Connecticut	-	Dr. Harriet Gesler
Delaware	-	Dr. Howard E. Row
New Jersey	-	Mr. W. Wayne Conrad
New York	-	Dr. Robert Lamatie
Pennsylvania	-	Mr. Herbert J. Edwards
Puerto Rico	-	Ms. Sara Lopez
Virgin Islands	-	Mr. Peter Rasmussen

Project Address:

Thomas J. Venables and W. Wayne Conrad
Coordinators, Title V Alternatives Project
Bureau of Planning
Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation
P.O. Box 2019
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

March, 1975

This position paper is a product of the Upper Atlantic Regional Interstate Project, funded by a Title V Grant from the U.S. Office of Education. The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

EA 008 055

March, 1975

The several policy positions outlined in this publication are not necessarily representative of policy positions taken by the State of New Jersey. The publication represents the combined efforts in research of the several participating states in the Upper Atlantic Regional Interstate Project. It is anticipated that the discussion and descriptions contained in this policy analysis will aid the departments of education in the research and planning activities within their respective states.

Sincerely,

Fred G. Burke

Fred G. Burke
Commissioner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction ii

Section I - Alternative Schools and Programs, both public and private 1

I. Definition 1

II. The Development of Alternatives 2

III. The Demand for Alternatives 3

IV. Identifying the Change Agents 4

V. The Threats Posed by Alternatives 5

VI. The Costs of Providing Alternatives 7

VII. Obstacles Confronting Alternatives 10

Section II - Four Positions Regarding Alternatives in Education 12

Policy Implications for Position I 13

Policy Implications for Position II 19

Policy Implications for Position III 23

Policy Implications for Position IV 25

Conclusion 27

Appendix

A. Operational Definition of Alternative 31

B. Taxonomy: Critical Areas of Differentiation Between Alternative Schools 33

C. Taxonomy: Examples of a Variety of Types Selected from Schools in the State of N.J. 35

D. Connecticut State Department of Education Development of Experimental Educational Programs. 41

E. Delaware State Department of Public Instruction Limited Standard Certification 43

Bibliography 47

INTRODUCTION

The idea of providing educational alternatives or options has become increasingly attractive to large numbers of parents, students and teachers. Educators have recently recognized that while traditional schools are meeting the needs of a majority of students, there is a significant number who would greatly benefit from something different. Alternative education is not merely an idea, it is a reality. A variety of schools and programs has arisen in response to demands for alternatives to traditional education. Their outreach has been limited because of their small size and number; however, their very existence has strongly influenced thinking on the part of the entire educational community.

The interest in options in education is manifested in the large volume of literature addressing the subject, as well as the expanding number of experiments in this area. Recently the Harvard Educational Review and Phi Delta Kappan each devoted an entire issue to the topic of alternative schools. Numerous books have also been published documenting individual alternative school experiences. Federal monies are currently financing two experiments in alternative education. The Berkeley, California Unified School District has established a system of 24 separate alternative schools with a grant from the Office of Education's Experimental Schools Program. The Alum Rock District in San Jose, California is experimenting with the Compensatory Voucher System, funded by a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity. This particular system for financing education was designed to foster educational variety. On the grass roots level, groups directly involved with alternatives have created state and national clearing houses and consortiums as a means of disseminating information and expanding support.

In several instances, state educational agencies have examined the interest in educational options and deduced that it is not a passing whim but an important indicator for the development of education in the future. The Commissioner of Education in New York has issued a statement in support of optional learning environments. The Vermont "Design for Education" also supports and encourages the development of alternatives. Most State Education Agencies encourage individualization of the learning process and thereby attempt to provide an alternative for each student.

If a state education agency wishes to be identified as a leader in meeting public needs, it must recognize the growth of alternative schools and programs as a movement in education which cannot and should not be ignored. Each state education

agency should undertake a study of the system of alternatives within its state to develop an understanding of why, for whom, and by whom alternatives are being created. The answers to these questions should be examined in light of existing policies and should provide a point of departure for developing a state position regarding options in education. This paper is offered as a starting point for such a study.

In Section I - Alternative Schools and Programs - both public and private alternatives are defined and described. Also addressed are the questions of why and for whom alternatives are created. The types of problems encountered and the costs incurred by alternatives are outlined to provide a base on which state education agency policy and involvement can be built.

In Section II - Four Positions Regarding Alternatives in Education - positions that a state education agency might adopt are identified: 1) to encourage the growth of alternatives by taking an active role in soliciting legislative, financial, and community support; 2) to support local efforts in developing alternatives by offering technical assistance and disseminating information regarding alternatives; 3) to maintain an attitude of ambivalence; 4) to discourage the growth of options by creating rules and regulations to impede their development. The concomitant policy implications for each position are enumerated and discussed.

Section I - Alternative Schools and Programs

I. Definition

The term "alternative" has often been used as a catch-all phrase for any non-traditional education program, regardless of philosophy or objectives. For some, alternatives conjures up an image of racially segregated private schools in the South, created as havens for white students whose parents chose to circumvent court-ordered integration. Programs serving as "dumping grounds" for intractable or "disturbed" students have also been labelled alternative. For purposes of this study such programs are not considered because they do not provide an element of choice for all students.

In this paper we include under the rubric of alternative a broad range of schools and programs, from the most structured to the least structured in regard to objectives, curriculum, and discipline. A typical taxonomy of alternatives includes:*

1. open classroom or open school
2. school without walls - the community serves as the classroom
3. learning centers - concentration of learning resources in one center available to all students in the community
4. street academies and drop out centers - for drop outs and potential drop outs, emphasis on the basic skills and career development
5. multicultural or bilingual schools
6. school within a school, or satellite school - a sub-unit of the original school based within or outside the main building
7. free schools - operated in the Summerhill tradition

One or more of the following usually characterizes the alternative schools listed above:

a. learning geared to individual needs of children

---

* For a more comprehensive taxonomy, see Appendix B

b. absence of institutionalized coercion regarding behavior or curriculum

c. elimination of competition and extrinsic motivation, encouragement and self-motivation

d. absence of a rigid system of grades or age segregation

e. de-emphasis of traditional curriculum and self-contained classroom

f. emphasis on individual abilities of teachers

A common thread joining the diverse programs is their commitment, to voluntary participation. Both the teachers and the students have the option of electing an alternative program from a variety of programs including the traditional public school program. For example, the Berkeley, California Unified School District established 24 separate alternative schools as part of the Office of Education's Experimental Schools Program. In Berkeley a full range of options exists and includes a traditional program as one viable alternative. In the Compensatory Voucher proposed by Christopher Jencks, a full system of alternatives also includes parochial and vocational schools.

II. The Development of Alternatives

Although most state education agencies and professional education associations have neither adopted a formal policy supporting alternatives, nor created a mechanism to foster their development, alternative schools have sprung up at a rapid rate both within and outside the public school system throughout the country. Allen Graubard describes the phenomenon as a movement from which he estimates at least 600 non-public schools have emerged. No accurate figures are available as to the total number of alternative schools actually in existence. Recently, however, alternative school resource centers and clearinghouses have been developed by concerned private groups to assist the schools in overcoming problems, and to promote the concept of options in education by disseminating information on developments across the nation.

Ten years ago the only alternatives to the traditional brand of education offered by public schools were either high cost, exclusive private schools or parochial schools, both of which by their very nature were effective options for only a small minority of school age children. The first group to rebel against the sacrosanct principles of public education consisted of parents disenchanted with the singular model of education which failed to respond to changing times and the needs of their children. The spin-off of their dissatisfaction

was the "free school" which emphasized freedom, creativity and the individual, priorities free school founders believed were in direct contrast to public schools. Free schools were limited in their outreach because of their small size, limited number, and often non-free tuition.

In the past five years the ranks of alternative education advocates have grown and sub-groups have arisen. One sub-group contends that any viable alternative must exist outside the public system to avoid being co-opted and swallowed up by it. Another sub-group has found that its efforts to implement change within the system have been frustrated and that the only route open to it is to leave the system. A more pragmatic group appreciates the fact that public schools have the money and the students, and recognizes that manipulation of the system may provide he greatest opportunity for the development of options at a level where they would have a significant impact. This group has recently succeeded in fostering the growth of alternatives within the system of public education.

III. The Demand for Alternatives

Students need alternatives for a variety of reasons. A study of student sub-groups in Chicago's Metro High School classified students according to "... attitudes, actions and patterns of associations." Although it was recognized that some students could not be accurately defined by any of the categories, most of the students were described as one of the following:

1. Black school oriented - academic achievers, regarded education as an opportunity to get ahead

2. Black consciousness/school oriented - similar to above, but goal was to promote Black political development by acquiring the necessary skills

3. Black school alienated - history of academic failure and conflicts with authority; manifestations of their identification with Black consciousness were in areas of music and dress

4. White school oriented - similar to Black school oriented

5. White school alienated/ethnic - history of academic failures; attitudes reflect their ethnic, conservative blue collar backgrounds; feel threatened by other subgroups

6. White school system alienated - politically conscious, counter culture, high achievers dissatisfied with the system which isn't meeting their expectations or needs, also non youth-culture students who simply don't like the system

Although many alternative high schools similar to the Metro School require a representative cross-section of students, in many cases alternatives are geared to or dominated by 2 or 3 of the subgroups: the White school system alienated subgroup, because they are most expressive in articulating their demands and dissatisfaction; or White school alienated ethnic and Black school alienated because their need is most visible and because teachers encourage special programs which afford them the opportunity to relinquish responsibility for these students whom they often consider "problem" students. Alternative schools are generally not created for, nor do they generally appeal to school oriented students. Ostensibly the traditional program is serving their needs, primarily because they have learned to adapt to the system and to internalize its standards of achievement and success.

Based on his experience as a high school principal, Henry Miller, the president of the New Jersey Association of Secondary School Principals, questioned: "What do you do for the 75 per cent of the students who are in the sways of mediocrity and disinterested in change?" He felt that there were no indications that the system served them well and provided them with an optimal learning environment, yet they express a preference for the traditional over something different and untried. Miller noted that student attitudes tend to reflect adult influence: parents who contend "that it was good enough for me," or those who assert (without documented support) that colleges require a traditional preparation. Average students can easily associate an alternative program with "hippies" or dropouts, with whom they don't wish to identify. If a full range of alternatives, rather than a single program, were developed and geared to a variety of interests and needs, these tradition oriented students may find programs more consonant with their values and goals and more attractive to students with whom they can identify. One such program, of course, may be the traditional elementary or secondary school as it has existed for years.

IV. Identifying the Change Agents

A preliminary survey of about 20 of the more than 40 public and private alternative schools and programs in the State of New Jersey indicates that the groups most instrumental in initiating alternatives were students, parents, and teachers. The particular group involved in developing an alternative directly influences the type of program that it offers. For example:

1. Street academies and drop-out centers are often the outcome of a strong rapport between concerned adults (e.g. street workers) and potential drop outs. Both groups recognize the need for a school or program that does not seek to alienate students from their cultures and is flexible enough to accommodate their other time commitments (e.g. work).

2. Alternative high school programs within the public system arise many times when students succeed in expressing their desire for programs relevant to their interests and life styles to a sympathetic listener, often a teacher with similar ideas. Together they develop a program which can be sold to the school administrators and school board.

3. Non public alternative high school programs tend to be developed by an alliance of students and teachers whose efforts toward change have been thwarted by bureaucratic resistance, or who feel that the system cannot serve their needs.

4. Alternative elementary programs within the public system often arise when progressive teachers interested in new ideas generate professional support for new programs as substitutes for the traditional classroom (e.g. open classroom or open school).

5. Non public alternative elementary programs prove to be a popular route for parents who are disillusioned with what they consider to be the stifling atmosphere of the public schools. By creating their own alternatives they can influence and contribute to their children's education and development.

V. The Threats Posed by Alternatives

To some, the act of creating an alternative school is in itself an attack on the venerable and vulnerable traditions of education, because it implies that the system is not adequately serving all students and that perhaps there exists something more desirable. Any new program threatens those whose power base is established within the foundations of bureaucracy and tradition; those persons tend not to be amenable to new ideas which necessitate a major shift in priorities and attitudes, and they even react in a manner that inhibits change. Often the education community (teachers, principals, and superintendents) are products of the traditional system, and their feelings that it has served them well make them reluctant to accept and adapt to change. Effective change requires a receptiveness and willingness to try the untried, as well as the development of a new pattern of responses on

the part of those persons initiating or affected by alternatives in education.

A. Local Superintendents

The main objective of the local superintendent of schools is to keep the system functioning without any major breakdowns; therefore, his concern is often to maintain the status quo rather than to initiate new ideas and programs. Any plans or demands for alternative schools must be well documented in terms of need and potential effectiveness if they are to win his support. The superintendent's determination to prevent disruptions in the system may prove to be a significant deterrent to change.*

B. Principals

Confronted with increasing administrative responsibilities, the high school principal is often overwhelmed by bureaucratic duties and finds little time for initiating change. His base of power is his decision making authority, and he may hesitate to implement changes that require the relinquishing of some of his authority. Alternative schools and programs often require a new managerial system, the restructuring of governance procedures, and the delegating of increased responsibilities for decision-making to students and teachers.

C. Teachers

Alternative programs place great demands for adaptation and flexibility on teachers. In many cases they are forced to redefine their roles as facilitators of learning rather than purveyors of knowledge which often requires the adaptation or discarding of prepared lectures and other instructional materials on which they have built what they may consider to be a successful teaching career. In addition, teachers must develop new skills to allow them to diagnose and prescribe for learning problems. Probably the most difficult task is breaking down the barriers and defenses built into standard teacher-student relationships in order to create an environment conducive to mutual trust and respect as well as a redefinition of authority.

---

* The ideas in this and subsequent paragraphs have been gleaned from discussions with: William Ramsey, President, N.J. Association of School Administrators, Mark Hurwitz, Executive Director, N.J. School Boards Association, Henry Miller, President, N.J. Association of Secondary School Principals.

D. School Board Members

School board members are often staunch supporters of the traditional system and may not react favorably to the idea of alternatives. In addition, as more communities are voting down school budgets, school boards cannot be expected to be particularly receptive to requests to implement alternative programs that may require budgetary increases or shifts in allocations. Another factor influencing school board reaction is the public's demand for accountability in its educational programs. Before agreeing to a shifting of priorities, school boards insist that an evaluation component be built into the alternative program to provide a mechanism for comparing alternatives with existing schools on a cost/effectiveness basis. Many alternative school people, however, resist the use of standardized achievement tests which they feel do not measure their program's objectives; they often opt for more subjective measurement criteria (e.g. student and parent attitudes) which do not facilitate a direct comparison of alternative and traditional schools and may not satisfy school board requirements.

VI. The Costs of Providing Alternatives

In this period of budgetary constraints for education, a major factor in implementing a new program is financial. The most prevalent question posed to supporters of alternatives in education is: "Do they entail an increased per pupil expenditure?" Some proponents of alternatives argue that alternative schools actually cost less than conventional schools. Realistically speaking, per pupil expenditure varies with the type of alternative program, although it does not follow that a program of higher per pupil costs provides a higher quality education.

A. Factors that may result in decreased costs for public alternative schools:

1. Increased utilization of qualified community people
   Alternative schools often have the capacity to mobilize and capitalize on resource people in the local business and academic communities, as well as parents and other students. They can be used in a variety of instructional or supervisory capacities, thereby expanding the range of curricula options that can be offered. Many community people are willing to provide their services on a volunteer basis, which can result in a decreased dependency on salaried teaching staff. (A word of caution: The manner in which community resource people may be utilized in public school systems depends on state laws and regulations pertaining to teacher certification; often non-certified persons may be allowed to complement, but not substitute for the teacher in the classroom).

2. The use of the community as an instructional environment - Many alternative programs promote student involvement in the community and may require some kind of community service in social agencies or other organizations of particular interest to the students. In addition, alternative school people encourage local industry to provide special courses for their students (e.g. electronics, printing, and chemistry). The "school without walls" program such as the Parkway program in Philadelphia depends almost entirely on the community for learning and instruction.

   The expanded utilization of community resources decreases the demand placed on school building facilities and may allow for a smaller expenditure on capital investment, or promote a more efficient utilization of the school building by expanding the number of students it can accommodate during the course of a school day. The creation of a "school without walls" program in an overcrowded school may remove the pressure for double sessions or a new school building.

   This decreased reliance on capital investment is also a result of other types of alternatives whose students feel a need to disassociate themselves from the school building because of its relationship to traditional education with which they may have had serious conflicts. Satellite schools and drop out centers are preferably located in storefronts or in sections of buildings such as churches or the YMCA, whose principal occupants are sympathetic to their cause. Often the rent is minimal or none at all.

3. Sharing resources - Many alternative programs do not allocate four to five textbooks per student, but rely on library resources and book contributions, in addition to their own purchases, which are often paperbacks. Students are encouraged to share books since uniform reading assignments are often not required.

   When offering courses that require high cost facilities such as a gymnasium or science labs, alternative schools (both non-public and those located outside of the main school building) often enter into cooperative agreements for sharing facilities with public schools or with the Y or other athletic centers.

B. Factors that may result in increased costs for public alternativetive schools:

1. Start-up costs - Although an alternative school may

operate at the same per pupil expenditure as a traditional program, start-up costs always require additional allocations. Start-up costs generally include planning, in-service training and workshops for staff, acquiring and/or adjusting building facilities, as well as supplies and equipment. Because of scheduling inflexibilities, the creation of an alternative program for 100 students is not accompanied by the release of 100 seats or a comparable number of other types of supplies for the alternative program. Some public programs, depending on size, location, etc. necessitate a considerable overlap in supplies and equipment.

2. Increased staff requirements - Sometimes it is not possible to release enough teachers from their duties in the existing program to adequately staff the alternative program, thus requiring an expansion of the school district's teaching staff. Some alternatives, such as street academies and drop out centers, stress the development of basic skills as well as close student/adult relationships. This often entails working with students in small groups or on a one-to-one basis and necessitates increased teacher-student ratios, implying increased per pupil costs in the long run.

3. Increased transportation costs - The establishment of an alternative school in a location outside the main building results in another loading and unloading station for school buses providing student transportation. An increase in loading stations requires an increased transportation budget.

   Courses provided by the community (e.g. local businesses) may also necessitate transporting students between school and the community resource centers. Sometimes the students bear these costs, but if the travelling is a regular part of the program, the travel costs are often beyond a student's means and the responsibility for providing transportation is placed on the school district.

   As the above comments have indicated, any discussion of the cost of alternatives must take into consideration the type of program proposed, its size, its location, and the school district's level of efficiency in utilizing resources prior to implementing the alternative as well as the average per pupil expenditure in the district.

VII. Obstacles Confronting Alternatives

Recently many books and manuals have been written to provide guidelines for developing alternatives as well as advice on overcoming problems that generally arise. Most of these articles touch upon the same areas, with the implication that the problems are not unique to a particular type of alternative and that one should expect to confront them in the development of almost any program. Those areas presenting the greatest difficulties are facilities, financial support, and community support. It should be kept in mind that there is considerable overlap and interaction among the three areas which often aggravate and compound the problems. For example, if the community is hostile to the alternative, the procurement of public monies to support the program is made even more difficult than usual.

A. Facilities location

If a public alternative is located outside of the main school building, its building facilities must be approved by the state education agency. In general state requirements for buildings used as schools are extremely rigid and prescribe standards for every aspect for the building, from height of ceiling, to width of stairways, to number of lavatory facilities. Inexpensive housing for an alternative school, such as a storefront often does not adhere to regulations and requires a large financial investment to bring it up to the standards.

Non-public schools are not subject to state building requirements, but must pass local building and health inspections. Buildings have been known to fail because they don't provide enough parking spaces. An unsympathetic or overly fastidious building inspector can make the securing of facilities into what may appear to be an insurmountable problem. In addition, if a school wishes to locate in a building (e.g. an old house) not zoned for a school, the persons establishing the school must request a zoning variance. Neighbors often react negatively to the prospect of locating a school in their block, and organize and appear en masse at the zoning hearing to effectively protest the issuance of a variance. Church basements are often used to house non-public alternative schools since they usually have the proper zoning ordinance if they are used for some sort of religious training.

B. Financial support

The public's increasing dissatisfaction with the quality of education, coupled with the increased burden placed on taxpayers because of upward spiraling costs, have resulted in a reluctance to establish new programs with their accompanying start-up costs. A new program that projects an increased per-pupil expenditure is regarded with extreme disfavor and its chances of approval are almost non-existent. Approval of an

alternative program is usually more difficult to obtain in a district in which the school budget is subject to public referenda, since few if any taxpayers are going to vote themselves a tax increase if they can avoid it.

Advocates of non-public alternative programs are often confronted with ideological conflicts as to the best way to raise funds for operating costs. They must either sacrifice large amounts of time (and frustration) to securing Foundation support (which is limited and usually only available for a fixed number of years) or charge tuition which out-prices and excludes many students. Charging tuition may not be feasible if the alternative is being created to serve children in a disadvantaged community. Some schools find it so difficult to exist outside the mainstream of public funds that they feel forced to compromise their ideologies and request to be included under the auspices of the public school system where they are subject to rules and regulations they have no part in formulating.

C. Community Support

The problems posed by locating facilities and financing are more easily overcome if the community believes in the alternative program and stands behind it. Community support, however, may be equally as difficult to obtain as financial support. If the alternative school is serving low income or disadvantaged students, parents can lend strong political support by organizing and appearing at school board meetings. In some cases this has actually happened when the existence of an alternative has been threatened. However, at the time of a program's inception, parents are often oblivious to what is happening or afraid the alternative is only being created as an excuse to get their children out of the schools. It is not until they see what they consider to be satisfactory results that their support is forthcoming.

Built into any program serving a small sub-group of students is a sense of rivalry and animosity between those students (and parents) included and those excluded, either by choice or by size limitations. In particular, alternative schools serving culturally alienated students often elicit the cry of elitism from non-participating students and their parents. They often find particularly distasteful the decreased student accountability in terms of attendance or curricular requirements; these programs have been assailed as "cop-outs" to education and as providing students with excuses not to learn. Most public alternative schools are open to all students on a lottery basis. In such cases some students elect not to participate because they are unwilling to assume a greater responsibility for their own learning. Others succumb to parental pressure to take a traditional college prep course because they believe it is a prerequisite for college admittance. Still others are reluctant to be separated from their peer group.

Any discussion of community support must be extended to include teachers' reactions. Teachers working in alternative schools are usually those who have expressed an interest in the concept and have volunteered to assist in its implementation. None are forced in or intentionally excluded, although an invisible dividing line may exist due to basic philosophical differences. The division of teachers into two physically separate and philosophically distinct groups can culminate in intense bitterness and rivalry between the two groups, each regarding the other with suspicion.

Finally, any program or school created to serve only a small sub-group of the entire population is extremely vulnerable to criticism from those not participating. This hostile reaction to what is considered a favored or special group may be eradicated by the creation of multiple and varied alternative programs to include everyone on an optional basis.

Section II - Four Positions Regarding Alternatives in Education

In delineating the four positions discussed in this section, an effort was made to understand the types of beliefs and value systems that might generate different formal positions regarding alternative education. The adoption of a position by a state education agency is not necessarily the result of a rational decision-making process; rather, it is more likely to be the product of a synthesis of often conflicting ideas and interests.

The discussions below depict possible circumstances which could result in the several different positions considered in the subsequent parts of this section. None of the discussions is intended to be comprehensive or indicative of the full array of opinions and attitudes that facilitate the adoption of the given formal position. No state education agency is likely to exclusively propound a single position.

Position I - encourage, initiate

A policy of educational options is considered to be the "wave" of education in the future. The state education agency believes that the growth of alternative schools can increase the responsiveness of the educational system to the needs of both students and parents, by enabling them to choose from a number of types of programs the one best suited to the interests and background of each student. It is decided that the state education agency will encourage the wide adoption of a system of alternatives by generating the types of incentives and flexibility that facilitate innovation.

Position II - facilitate, support

The state education agency acknowledges that educational alternatives are best developed at the grass roots level by groups with expressed interests in a particular type of program. The prevailing theme within the state education agency is that each community can best identify the programs that fulfill its needs, and that the role of the state is to provide technical expertise to communities to assist them in planning and developing new programs. In addition, the state education agency hopes to win support for the idea of educational options by disseminating information about successful programs to all members of the educational community.

Position III - maintain an attitude of ambivalence

Although the number of alternative schools and programs has grown over the past five years, their popularity is considered to be just another short-lived trend in education. The best policy for the state education agency is to ignore the movement in an effort to prevent an exaggeration of its implications for the traditional system of education. Policies should be implemented with no consideration of their implications for alternatives, either positive or negative. If the movement is to have an impact on education as its supporters assert, it must prove itself by sustaining growth over the next five, ten, or twenty years, before the adoption of a different state position is justified.

Position IV - discourage, thwart

The alternative schools movement is considered by the state education agency to be inimical to the system of public education because it is geared to particular types of students, thereby excluding large sub-groups of the total student population. The growth of alternative schools has had the effect of diverting monies as well as talented teachers away from the system. These schools serve only to segregate students of varying interests and backgrounds and de-emphasize the basic skills in favor of what are considered to be transient issues. The state education agency recognizes the need to enhance the traditional system of equal education while simultaneously impeding the growth of alternatives by developing or emphasizing obstacles which should prove to be insurmountable for non-traditional schools.

Policy Implications for Position I - encourage, initiate

The following policies should enhance the state's position of encouraging and actively initiating alternative schools and programs.

1. Experimental Schools

Most state education agencies are charged with the responsibility of encouraging, developing, and disseminating information about quality educational programs. Agencies should interpret this obligation as a mandate to promote the development of a series of experimental programs designed to serve as prototype alternative programs. The purpose, of course, of designating certain programs "experimental" is to provide a mechanism for developing well-planned alternatives which will not be subject to the rigidities and inertia of the public school system.

The state education agency should develop guidelines for defining an experimental program with the authority for its approval residing with the Chief State School Officer (See Appendix D - Connecticut Code or Development of Experimental Educational Programs). Upon application of those programs designated experimental, the Chief State School Officer will have the prerogative of waiving all statutory and administrative requirements. A request for a waiver must explain the program's objectives and how the existing statute might limit its effectiveness. An important function of such a program is the generation of new ideas that would not be feasible within the existing framework to help determine if and how state regulations impinge on the development of new ideas, and how a change might facilitate more creative options for students.

Some of the areas in which waivers might be requested include requirements for attendance, curriculum, buildings, and teacher certification (See Appendix E - Delaware Teacher Certification Requirements). In addition to the waiver privilege, it may be decided that these schools should be given first priority in requests for technical and financial assistance. Although the program development will be overseen by the state education agency, the programs will remain under the jurisdiction of their local school board and district.

2. Expansion of State Aid Program for Pupil Transportation

For many alternative programs the community is an important component of the learning environment. Students are en encouraged to volunteer in social service agencies or attend special courses provided by business organizations. These types of programs make it necessary for the students to move between the school and the community during the course of the day. If the school is not centrally located or readily accessible to the central business district, the students must be transported by school busses or public transportation, and the costs borne by the individual student or the local school district. Requiring students to finance the expense may severely restrict the number and backgrounds of students who can afford to participate in such a program. On the other hand, local school boards may be hesitant to support child study within the community if an additional appropriation is necessary.

In most states local districts typically allocate only a small fraction of their budget to pupil transportation because they rely on the state to provide most of the costs (based on distance guidelines). Under most existing statutes, state aid is limited to the home to school and return trip and is not applicable to special purpose trips. The present legislation could be expanded to support the development of programs within the community by assisting local districts in meeting the increased transportation costs.

An amendment to the existing statute could provide for aid for trips that are required as a regular part of the students' program with a stipulation that these funds not be used for special trips for which local districts are presently responsible. Another possibility is expanding the program: increasing the state's portion of support to 100 per cent of the costs for pupil transportation between school and home where this is not already the case. For districts providing alternative programs, the increase in aid would release local funds which in turn could be allocated to cover the costs of transporting students between the school and the community. This modification need not directly affect alternative programs since many districts may regard the increased aid as an opportunity to reduce their budgets rather than as an opportunity to readjust their priorities in favor of alternative programs by helping to defray their pupil transportation costs. Therefore, the provision aimed directly at alternatives is preferable to a program of increased state aid.

3. Building in Incentives in a State Aid Program

Most state aid programs provide support based on average daily attendance in a district with adjustments to reflect the differences in costs for educating different levels of students. Most weighting systems give more weight to high school students than to elementary students, and even greater weight to vocational and handicapped students because of the extra costs incurred by providing more specialized programs. Any financing scheme incorporating a system for weighting students could include a category for students studying in alternative schools and programs in addition to the present categories as to educational level. The actual weighting accorded to alternative students will depend on the base figure allotted to a unit weight as well as the amount deemed sufficient to serve as an incentive factor. A system of monitoring the development of alternatives around the state would have to be maintained to enable the administrators of the state aid program to discriminate between alternatives and innovations.

State financial legislation which includes an incentive equalization aid component that guarantees a property tax base according to each district's classification might be adapted to

encourage alternative schools and programs. Incentives could be built into the district classification descriptions so that districts having more alternative programs would receive more state funds. Once again a state monitoring system to discriminate between alternatives and innovations would be necessary.

4. Prepare Teachers for Involvement in Alternative Schools and Programs

Most college programs for teacher preparation place little or no emphasis on developing special skills that may be needed in schools that are non-traditional. Teachers in the existing alternative schools are often responsible for developing skills and techniques on their own. As the concept of alternatives burgeons and gains wider acceptance, special training sessions are being instituted to assist the teacher in adapting to a new learning environment in which the role of the teacher has been redefined.

College programs for teacher preparation must be approved by the state education agency. A prerequisite for approval should be established by the state education agency requiring each program to place a fixed proportion, (e.g. 5 per cent) of its student teachers in alternative programs for their practical experience. As the alternative movement expanded, the number of teachers in those schools would be increased accordingly.

The purpose of this requirement is not to compel students to teach in alternative environments, but rather to stimulate interest in the concept and to help prepare them for future involvement by affording them an option to working within the traditional framework. Those students who opt for an experience in an alternative program should be able to generate enough interest to induce the college to provide the types of courses in methods and techniques for non-traditional classrooms that they regard as imperative for their professional development.

The reaction of alternative schools to cooperating with a student-teacher program is difficult to predict. Certainly some of the schools may reject the idea based on a pre-judgment that the student teachers do not have an ideological commitment to their school. The response to the idea will vary with the school. To promote an amicable working relationship with alternative programs, colleges should not assign a student teacher to a program without an interview and the consent of the program. A major attribute of student teachers from the perspective of the alternative is that they offer their services at no cost and thereby increase the teacher-student ratio at no additional expense.

5. Provide a Mechanism for Parents to Educate their Children

Alternative education has been institutionalized within the framework of the school, either within or outside the public system. The growth of non-institutionalized alternatives should be fostered by providing parents with an opportunity to educate their children.

Keeping a child home from school so that he can be educated by his parents is subject to two legal issues: truancy and the question of whether the child is receiving an equivalent education. Truancy is a criminal act, and it is the jurisdiction of a designated municipal court or the state education agency to decide if the parents are providing an "equivalent" education for their children, with the burden of proof resting on the parents. This combination of legal "hassles" has proven to be an effective deterrent for most parents interested in instructing their children.

The question of equivalent education should be taken out of the courts and decided by the Chief State School Officer. A procedure should be established for authorizing parents to teach their own children, subject to regular monitoring by the state education agency. To support such a program, the act of truancy should be redefined and incorporated under the education statutes. A mechanism for educating their own children expands the options available to parents in deciding how their children can best be educated.

6. Facilitate the Development of Alternative Schools Outside the Main School Building

Any building that is to be used for instructing students in the public school system must be approved by an office of the state education agency, fire, safety, and health officials and must adhere to extremely rigid standards which prescribe for every conceivable aspect of the building. Many of the requirements do not bear directly on the quality of the educational environment, (e.g., In one state the required height of the ceiling is 9'6", and a water fountain must be provided for every x number of students). These rigid standards effectively permit only buildings constructed at high capital expense to be utilized for education; they serve as an obstacle for the development of public alternative schools within a local system which are more appropriately housed outside the main school building, often in a structure which was not specifically designed as a school and thus does not meet the state specifications.

The building requirements should be carefully reviewed to determine which factors are related to health and significantly affect the students' well being, and which could be

removed at no cost to the students or the learning environment. Many of the specifications could be denoted as "recommended" rather than "required" thereby removing many of the stipulations that restrict the use of buildings otherwise suitable as satellite schools or dropout centers.

7. Seed Money

Many experimental education programs within the public system are awarded grants three or four times in excess of standard budgets for established programs. As a result, no one has a real stake in the experiment: local districts have made no financial commitment to it and non-participating teachers are jealous of its special resources to which they have no access. Thus the life of the program is tied directly to the grants and it ends when the grant expires because the local district is unable or unwilling to absorb the program due to its prohibitive costs.

If alternative schools are to be considered an integral part of a local system, they must be developed in a manner that minimizes community alienation and maximizes economic viability. Therefore, special funds appropriated to the development of alternatives should be designated specifically for capital expenses associated with start-up. Funds for daily operating costs should be allocated from the local district's budget.

In this period of severe economic constraints, most districts are hesitant or financially unable to initiate new educational programs because of the concomitant start-up costs. The state education agency should initiate a program of grants defined as risk money and restricted to use in planning and developing an alternative, with no other strings attached. Guidelines for the grant should limit its duration to 2-3 years, should establish ceilings on a per student basis, and may stipulate a level for local matching of funds. This type of grant should encourage the creation of alternatives that can operate at the existing level of per pupil expenditure and in which the local district has a vested interest.

In addition to a special grant program for alternatives, other potential sources of funds might include a program of state "mini-grants" with funds awarded to teachers with alternative proposals, and Title III, ESEA, which is designed to encourage innovations, one of which could be the development of options in education.

8. Experiment with the Voucher System

A system of regulated, compensatory education vouchers as proposed by the Center for the Study of Public Policy was designed to foster parental interest and educational variety. By placing education in a system of free markets and competition, vouchers are expected to encourage the development of many new alternatives in response to the demands of a pluralistic society.

The voucher system has been the subject of considerable controversy. However, the Office of Economic Opportunity has considered the voucher system worthy of experiment and has developed a program to support experimentation on the local level by absorbing all the additional costs involved in instituting a voucher system. Although various cities have expressed interest in the program, most teachers' organizations have succeeded in defeating proposals to experiment with vouchers; only one experiment has actually developed -- in Alum Rock School District, San Jose, California. Because of its short duration, the actual success or failure of that program has not been conclusively determined although it has lent credence to the supposition that the system does foster the growth of alternatives.

The offer of financial assistance by O.E.O. to supplement local expenditures in implementing a voucher system makes it a propitious time for districts as well as states to consider experimenting with the concept. The state education agency need not adopt a policy on vouchers; however, because of its expressed concern with the development of alternatives, the agency should encourage local districts to consider an experiment with vouchers and assist any districts that may express interest in overcoming the many obstacles that will inevitably arise.

In addition to the suggestions put forward under this position, many of those suggested under position II - facilitate, support, can also be utilized to encourage the development of alternative schools and programs.

Policy Implications for Position II - facilitate, support

Given that a position is adopted for supporting and facilitating the growth of alternatives on the local level, the state education agency should implement the type of policies described below.

1. Create an Office of Innovative and Alternative Education

The reasons for bringing together under one roof all the groups and projects directly related to innovative and alternative education are twofold: 1) to promote interaction and to coordinate the efforts of the diverse groups working toward

similar ends, and 2) to establish recognition, both within and outside the state education agency, of the significance of innovative and alternative education as a major priority of the administration. The Office's responsibilities in terms of alternative education would include the compilation and dissemination of information about alternatives to local districts and private groups involved in planning alternative schools and programs.

There may presently exist a number of non-contiguous programs within the state education agency which are primarily concerned with the implementation of innovations on the local level; most of these programs have or exhibit potential for having positive effects for alternative education. Because the programs function as components of different divisions and offices, there is probably no concerted effort to coordinate objectives and goals. The result is a disjointed approach, an overlap of efforts, and repetition of problems.

An inventory of the state education agency should be conducted to determine which programs and personnel should be included in the new office. A coordinator should be appointed to promote interest within the department, train staff members, and inform the public of developments in the field of alternative education.

The creation of an office whose principal concern is innovative and alternative education should not eliminate involvement in this and related areas on the part of other divisions and offices within the state education agency. Rather, the Office should provide the mechanism to enhance the effectiveness of programs designed to foster the development of innovative and alternative education by coordinating efforts and assisting in the definition of program objectives which complement each other. The Office should work cooperatively with the rest of the agency, as well as with auxiliary components and state and local educational associations.

2. Workshops and Training Sessions

Because alternative education is a relatively new concept with which few educators have had direct involvement, an important aspect of any program supporting alternatives is a consciousness-raising and skill-training component. Education administrators need to be made aware of the alternative programs currently in existence and their potential impact for their schools and districts. In addition, training sessions should be conducted in the areas of need identification, building community support, and elements of a successful program.

Teachers cannot be expected to react favorably to new programs without a complete understanding of the demands that will be placed on them as a result of such programs. They need to be informed and instructed in the types of skills that will be required in an alternative program.

The state education agency and its intermediate units should develop in joint effort with state educational associations a series of workshops for teachers, administrators, local school board members, and state education agency staff members. In order to have far-reaching effects without exorbitant costs, the workshops for teachers should be conducted on a multi-district level, and attended by small groups of interested teachers from each district. An appeal to those teachers who have an expressed interest in the subject should promote teacher professionalism by relying on a few to disseminate information and generate support for an idea in which they believe. In-service training sessions should also be developed in conjunction with local districts as a necessary next step to the workshops to aid teachers in acquiring the skills and techniques that will be required in the type of alternative for which they are being trained.

3. Develop a Detailed Analysis of Alternative Schools and Programs

Comprehensive case studies of successful alternatives should be prepared and disseminated to those districts that are considering developing an alternative, to afford them the opportunity to assess possible programs in terms of effectiveness and potential costs and problems, prior to making their final decisions. Successful programs should be identified to represent the full range of alternatives, both public and private on each educational level.

Included in each study should be a detailed analysis of the school's policies and objectives, its successful practices vs. its failures, problems encountered as well as techniques used to overcome them. In addition, each study should document the perceptions of the program by various subgroups of students, parents, and staff members. The financial aspect of the study should include a breakdown of expenses, unanticipated costs, and sources of funds.

4. Provide Assistance in Obtaining Funds

The securing of financial support is a primary source of frustration for both public and private alternatives. To assist educators in their quest for funding, a comprehensive list of potential sources of funding should be compiled, including state and federal programs as well as foundations that support educational endeavors. In addition to programs designed specifically for education, an investigation of state and federal programs

should include related programs sponsored by other agencies, such as legal, health, and drug abuse agencies, which might be applicable for a particular type of alternative.

The writing of project proposals and requests for funding is a skill that must be well-developed if it is to be effective. The expertise of certain staff members of the state education agency should be made available to local districts and private groups to assist them in drafting well structured funding proposals. These groups should be informed that such a service exists and encouraged to use it.

5. Promote Community Interest in Options in Education

Community support has proven to be a necessary ingredient for the success of any new program. If the public is going to take an interest in alternative education they must be well-informed as to the possible implications for their locality. A program of public information about alternatives should include the philosophical reasons for options in education as well as the range of alternatives that can be created to appeal to the varied interests and abilities of students. The program should be operated by the state education agency in conjunction with local school districts and civic organizations. Visual displays, discussions, newspaper articles, and public service television, and dissemination kits can all be employed to keep the public abreast of new ideas in alternative education.

6. Student Newsletter on Alternatives

A newsletter could be distributed to all students citing and describing alternative projects and schools in the state. The purpose of the newsletter would be to promote student awareness of the types of programs that could be available to them and to generate student enthusiasm for initiating change. Students have proven themselves to be change agents, but to be effective in promoting change, students must have well-developed skills in leadership as well as an understanding of how the system works and where the bases of power lie. Leadership training workshops for students could be organized to enable students to develop the skills to funnel their enthusiasm into significant actions for change.

7. Provide Technical Assistance in Evaluating Alternatives

The question of how alternatives can best be evaluated has not been thoroughly explored. The confidence of the public and the local school board in new programs is built on measures of effectiveness. Yet many alternative program educators resist evaluation because they abhor the use of normative-based achievement tests whose objectives cannot be equated with the objectives of the schools. In addition, the comparison of programs

based on test scores is considered inappropriate because the development of test-taking skills is not a priority in many alternative schools. Some of the problems inherent in an evaluation of alternative schools are: a lack of qualified evaluators with sensitivity and understanding of the concept of alternative education necessary to measure its effectiveness; a tendency to establish performance criteria based on expectations of traditional programs; and the inadequacy of evaluation instruments, particularly in the affective domain.

Recently an increasing number of instruments have been developed specifically for evaluating non-traditional programs. Special efforts for measuring the effectiveness of alternative schools have been demonstrated in the evaluation design for the METRO High Schools Program in Chicago and the Ford Foundation's evaluation of Philadelphia's Parkway Program.

The state education agency should assemble a team of experts in the area of evaluation who would be responsible for keeping abreast of the latest instruments being developed to evaluate alternatives and for assisting, through teacher aides, materials, and workshops, local programs in adapting these instruments to meet their needs. The evaluation team would be required to work closely with local boards to encourage them to explore the variety of measurement techniques, (e.g., attendance rate, drop out rate) that can be used for comparing different programs. The types of measures that could be incorporated into a comprehensive evaluation should be enumerated and explained to educators on the local level, and could be one component of a training workshop for evaluating alternatives.

Policy Implications for Position III - maintaining an attitude of ambivalence

By maintaining an attitude of ambivalence the state education agency in effect establishes a "non-position" position on alternatives. Such a position may be the result of one of two divergent schools of thought. The attitude may prevail among state education officials that the alternative movement is really no movement at all, and is in fact inconsequential and of no threat to the traditional system of public education. It may be decided that the best method to speed its demise is to ignore it; therefore, no position is necessary, and the system proceeds as if alternative schools do not exist. On the other hand, there are educators who may believe that alternatives render a valuable service to the public by providing options from which it can choose. They contend that it would diminish their attractiveness as an option if alternatives were to be institutionalized and incorporated into the system. Rather they believe that alternatives should be allowed to develop as demand warrants and to

co-exist peacefully alongside traditional public schools. For either of the two beliefs, the strategy is the same, "business as usual."

Although many state education agencies are presently maintaining an attitude of ambivalence toward alternatives, their "non-position" position is usually a result of the interplay of the two attitudes described above. Within any organizational structure it is impossible to find consensus on all levels on a controversial issue, and alternatives in education is no exception. The resulting disparity in attitudes has fostered the development of policies which often work at cross purposes with regard to alternatives. For example, a new program for awarding course credit for community work may provide the flexibility necessary for establishing some alternative programs; on the other hand, guidelines may be developed for approving private secondary schools which severely circumscribe the independence of private alternatives.

The implications of "non-position" policies for alternatives are in large part determined by the persons most likely to come in contact with alternatives; it is their personal bias toward alternatives coupled with their interpretation of policy that ultimately prescribe how alternatives are going to be dealt with. For private schools, that person is the one responsible for approving secondary high schools; for public schools it may be the persons responsible for approving curriculum, or administering grants under Title III. Although in most of these areas there are guidelines for action, the lack of a formal position with regard to alternatives provides enough room to allow for individual subjectivity.

The prevailing ambivalence toward alternatives has afforded local districts some latitude in developing the programs that they consider most suited to their constituency, with no state restrictions as to homogeneity or the number of options that they are compelled to provide. A growing number of alternatives have evolved in this manner. Similarly, the alternative movement outside the public system has received little state assistance and has encountered few state imposed obstacles.

It is difficult to surmise how this "non-position" position has affected the growth of alternatives, if at all. One thing is clear: this period of severe economic constraints has had negative implications for education, particularly for schools outside the public system. Increasing tuition rates have resulted in a dwindling market for private schools; in addition, the disinclination of foundations to support new educational ventures has increased the difficulty of developing an alternative school.

Although the average life of an alternative school is approximately two years, it is not evident that economic hardship is the sole factor. The battles for survival with funding agencies, school boards, bureaucracies, and other opponents may sap its energies and make it impossible for the school to realize its educational objectives. Community and financial support are so intricately related that a school cannot survive with one and not the other.

If the state education agency continues to maintain its attitude of ambivalence, the fate of the alternative movement rests with the public; it will depend on whether disenchantment with the traditional brand of education burgeons or subsides, and if the public considers alternatives in education to be a viable solution to the problem and supports them. To predict the future of alternatives therefore requires knowledge of attitudes toward education, as well as insight into the political and economic climate.

Policy Implications for Position IV - discourage, thwart

Outlined below are a number of steps that the state education agency should take in an effort to discourage or thwart the growth of alternative schools and programs.

1. Prescribe a Statewide Curriculum

Minimal statewide curricular requirements often allow the flexibility for developing special programs whose objectives may not be defined in terms of basic skills. A statewide curriculum would help to spawn homogeneity among all schools. In addition, it would reduce the demand for alternative programs because by statute they, too, would be required to offer courses in the same areas as does the regular school.

2. Limit the Practice of Awarding Academic Credit for Non-Academic Work

The present state policy for awarding course credits can be altered to preclude the awarding of academic credits for non-academic work such as volunteer work within the community. Decisions regarding this question should be removed from local administrators and reserved for the chief state school officer.

To prevent an interpretation contrary to state education agency philosophy, well-defined guidelines for implementing any such programs could be promulgated by the chief state school officer. The type of work which can be awarded credit must be explicitly stated as well as the number of hours considered acceptable for credit. Also, a ceiling should be set limiting the number of academic credits than can be required under this type of program to prevent a student or program from removing the emphasis in education from basic skills in favor of community involvement.

3. Criteria for Funding Special Projects

Special funds available to finance innovation should be directed to programs in the area of basic skills. Title III, ESEA, should emphasize programs that have potential for transferability to schools around the state. State education agency officials can select those programs which have proven successful, and can assist other local districts with their implementation. Guidelines for selecting programs to be funded should proscribe the awarding of grants for programs that tend to separate subgroups of students from the mainstream of the student body.

4. Registering and Approval of Private Schools

A mechanism for regulating private schools should be established to require that private schools be licensed by the state education agency and adhere to state guidelines. A State Board of Private Academic Schools similar to that of Pennsylvania should be created within the state education agency. Such a board could promulgate rules and regulations regarding school plants, courses of study, instructional equipment, and the certification of teachers and assistant teachers.

By providing a structural framework within which private schools can be developed, the state education agency can increase its authority over private schools, and subsequently inhibit the growth of alternative schools whose precarious financial situation may often make it impossible for them to adhere to any state guidelines.

5. Statewide Testing

Although it is not a well-established practice among states, incentive aid can be a function of test scores. State goals can be reinforced by developing tests to be administered statewide which measure progress in the basic skills; the test results will provide an instrument to measure and compare the effectiveness of different programs, as well as to allocate state aid. By attaching incentive aid to test scores homogeneity in education will be encouraged because teachers will be pressured to teach materials covered in the tests, thereby reducing options among and within courses.

Conclusion

As alternative schools and programs continue to flourish, they are gaining increased recognition as an important element in shaping the direction of education for the future. Because of their potential impact, state education agencies should examine how the growth of educational options best complements and contributes to the existing system of public education and should adopt a position in accordance with these objectives. Consideration should be given now to the formulation of a position regarding educational options, for the movement is presently in a developmental stage where its direction can be strongly influenced by state policy.

This paper has delineated four positions that a state education agency might consider in developing a stand on alternatives; it should not be construed as advocating one particular position over all others. A study of educational alternatives and, in particular, the problems and obstacles they encounter provided the framework for developing each set of policy implications. The policy implications explored for each position provide a comprehensive description of the types of action that would be necessary to win support for the position on the state and local level and encourage its successful development.

A task force should be created within the state education agency to determine what position is most feasible in terms of how the development of alternatives relates to the state's educational goals and objectives. This paper should help the task force recognize which policy considerations would be in line with a particular position on alternatives. A position can be clearly formulated and a strategy determined by an indepth study of the policy implications outlined in this paper.

appendices:

APPENDIX A

Operational Definition of Alternative

Alternative School

An autonomous or semiautonomous institution, either public or private, that is providing an educational program that is significantly different from the programs in conventional public or nonpublic schools for children of similar age range. A key characteristic of the school is that it is accessible by choice, permitting pupils, with parents' consent, to opt to attend rather than remain in the conventional public or non-public school. Well known examples are: Philadelphia's Parkway School, Rochester's World of Inquiry Elementary School, and John Dewey High School in New York City.

Alternative Program

A special program instituted in a public or non-public school for a number of pupils that provides them with learning opportunities that differ significantly from those commonly available in the school's academic, occupational, or work-study programs. Examples are: alternative programs for seniors such as extended work in social agencies, combined high school-college programs, etc.; alternative physical education programs; programs conducted outside the school using community resources; and many of the so-called "schools without a school" or "mini-schools."

APPENDIX B

Taxonomy: Critical Areas of Differentiation between Alternative Schools

Level

1. Elementary
2. Intermediate
3. Secondary

Geography

1. Urban
2. Suburban/rural

Governance and Authority

1. Teachers
2. Teachers and parents
3. Teachers and students
4. Director
5. Outside Authority (Board of Education, Superintendent, etc.)

Curriculum Emphasis

1. Basic skills
2. Therapeutic
3. Cultural/ethnic
4. Enrichment (arts, media, environment)

Method

1. Open classroom/school (independent study with advisory, apprenticeships, school-without-walls)
2. Technologically managed (programmed instruction, television managed instruction)
3. Behavior modification

Appendix B (Continued)

4. Teacher managed/lecture
5. Peer instruction/tutorial

Funding

1. Local education agency
2. Parochial
3. Federal
4. State
5. Foundation
6. Tuition
7. Miscellaneous

Target Group

1. Black school oriented
2. Black school alienated
3. White school oriented
4. White school alienated (working class)
5. White culturally alienated
6. Bilingual
7. Emotionally disturbed

Type

1. Public (local education agency)
2. Independent (Private)
3. Parochial
4. State or federal program

APPENDIX C

Taxonomy: Examples of a Variety of Types Selected from Schools in the State of New Jersey

Elementary: Independent (Private)

1. Montessori (Bede Montessori School, Englewood, New Jersey)
   - student population-white
   - location-urban suburban
   - authority-director, staff
   - funding-tuition
   - curriculum/method-Montessori
2. Parent-Teacher Cooperative (Children of the Rainbow, Plainfield, New Jersey)
   - student population-white, black
   - authority-parents/staff
   - location-urban, suburban
   - curriculum/method-open classroom
   - funding-tuition, foundation, misc.
3. Community School (Ironbound Children's Center, Newark, New Jersey)
   - student population-black, bilingual, white
   - authority-parents, director, staff
   - location-urban
   - curriculum-cultural/ethnic
   - method-open classroom, teacher-managed
   - funding-foundation, federal, misc.

Appendix C (Continued)

4. Integrated Day School - British Model (Anselmo School, Frenchtown, New Jersey)

   . student population-white

   . authority-director, staff

   . location-suburban

   . curriculum/method-open classroom, integrated day

   . funding-tuition, misc.

5. Free School (Family School, Atlantic City, New Jersey)

   . student population-white

   . authority-students, staff, parents

   . location-suburban, rural, urban

   . curriculum/method-free, organic

Elementary: Public

1. Self-Contained Open Classroom

   . authority-teacher, administrator

   . curriculum/method-open classroom

2. Mini-school-more than one class

   . authority-teacher, administrator

   . curriculum/method-open classroom, ungraded

3. Individualized Instruction

   . authority-teacher, administrator

   . curriculum/method-IGE, IPI, team teaching

4. Behavior Modification Program

   . authority-teacher, administrator

   . curriculum/method-behavior modification

   . student population-emotionally disturbed, neurologically impaired

Appendix C (Continued)

5. Bilingual Program

   . authority-teacher, administrator

   . curriculum-cultural, ethnic, traditional method-ESL

6. Technology-Based Program

   . authority-program designers, teachers

   . curriculum/method-programmed instruction, instructional TV, audio-visual

High Schools: Public

1. Alternative Programs (Rumson-Fair Haven Senior Elective Program)

   . curriculum-enrichment

   . method-school without walls, independent study, apprenticeship

   . population-gifted students

   . authority-teachers, administrator

2. Multi-unit High School (North Hunterdon Regional)

   . curriculum-traditional enrichment

   . method-flexible school day, modular block schedule, multi-grade team strategy, interdisciplinary approach, ESY

   . population-cross section

   . authority-teachers, administrator

3. Drop Out Program

   . population-disciplinary problems, potential drop outs

   . curriculum-traditional, basic skills, other

   . method-teacher managed, school without walls, open, other

   . authority-teachers, administrator

Appendix C (Continued)

4. School-within-a-school

   . population-cross section, gifted

   . curriculum-traditional, enrichment

   . method-open, school without walls, independent study, other

   . authority-administrator, teachers

5. Satellite High School (Cinnaminson Alternative High School)

   . population-cross section, potential drop outs, disciplinary problems, gifted

   . curriculum-enrichment, cultural/ethnic

   . method-school without walls, apprenticeship, teacher-managed, peer instruction, independent study

   . authority-teachers, students, administrator

High Schools: Non-Public

1. Therapeutic Community (Chelsea School, Long Branch, New Jersey)

   . population-emotionally disturbed, drug dependent

   . curriculum-emotional health, basic skills

   . method-group therapy, teacher instruction, behavior modification, open

   . authority-teachers

   . funding-state, federal, foundation

2. Independent High School - Middle Class (Changes, Inc., East Orange, New Jersey)

   . population-white culturally alienated

   . curriculum-enrichment

   . method-school without walls, independent study, teacher-instruction, peer instruction, apprenticeship, groups

   . authority-students, teachers

   . funding-tuition, foundations, misc.

Appendix C (Continued)

3. Independent High School - Working Class (Independence High School, Newark, New Jersey)

   . population-white school alienated

   . curriculum-basic skills, enrichment

   . method-teacher instruction, school without walls, group therapy, apprenticeships

   . authority-teachers

   . funding-tuition, foundations, misc.

4. Community Centers (Our House, West Orange, New Jersey)

   . population-white culturally alienated, school alienated, emotionally disturbed

   . curriculum-affective, therapeutic, enrichment

   . method-free

   . authority-participants

   . funding-misc.

5. Free High Schools (Free School, Bergen County, New Jersey)

   . population-white culturally alienated

   . curriculum-organic, misc.

   . method-free

   . authority-students, teachers

   . funding-tuition, misc.

6. Street Academies

   . population-black school oriented

   . curriculum-basic skills, traditional, cultural/ethnic

   . method-teacher instruction

   . authority-director, teachers

   . funding-federal, state, misc.

   . location-urban

Appendix C (Continued)

7. Alternative Programs in Private Schools

   . population-white upper class

   . curriculum-enrichment

   . method-school without walls, independent study, apprenticeship, etc.

   . authority-teachers, students, administrators

   . funding-tuition

8. Drop Out Center (Project Build, Trenton, New Jersey)

   . population-black school alienated

   . curriculum-basic skills

   . method-teacher instruction, apprenticeships, individualized instruction, vocational training

   . authority-administrators, teachers

   . funding-federal, state, municipal

   . location-urban

APPENDIX D

The Connecticut State Department of Education - Development of Experimental Educational Programs:

"SECTION 10-76K (Formerly Section 10-761) DEVELOPMENT OF EXPERIMENTAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

(a) The board of education of any school district, or any other public or private nonprofit organization or agency, may prepare and develop experimental educational plans and submit them to the state board of education provided all such proposals coming from organizations other than a board of education shall be approved by the board of education of the school district before submission to the state board. Each such plan shall specify, describe and support with reasons the following: (1) The objectives of such plan: (2) the methods of evaluation to be employed; (3) the area to be served by and from which pupils will be drawn for the experimental educational project; (4) the policies, standards and methods to be employed in the selection of pupils; (5) the policies, standards and methods with respect to the operation of the project, including administrative organization, grouping of pupils, educational and instructional practices, the use and functioning of teachers and other instructional and supervisory personnel choice of educational materials and equipment, allocation of curricular time and use of extra-school cultural facilities; (6) the site, size, design, estimated capital cost and method of financing of any school or other building, or specific standards and criteria for determining the same; (7) the expected sources of financial support together with estimates of the required annual budgets for the first two years of operation, exclusive of capital costs of land and buildings; (8) the policies and standards with respect to professional staff, including qualifications, estimated salary scales and methods of selection of professional personnel; and (9) provision for direct participation by members of the communities and students to be served by such experimental educational projects, in planning, policy-making and service function affecting such projects. The state board of education may accept, reject or modify any such experimental educational project, or it may request the revision and resubmission of such plan, if said board finds such plan does not conform to the educational interests of the state, as defined in Section 10-4a and other sections of the general statutes. Acceptance of an experimental educational project by the state board of education shall constitute compliance of the plan with this and other sections of this title. (b) The state board of education shall furnish assistance to all applicants in the planning and developing of projects under this section. (c) All experimental educational projects conducted pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be evaluated at least annually. The state

board of education shall, on or before March first annually, review with the joint standing committee on education of the general assembly all applications for projects, state board action on such proposals, the current programs, evaluations of such programs, and such other information as said committee may require in order to inform itself about such programs. (1969, P.A. 640; 1971, P.A. 430)."

APPENDIX E

Delaware State Department of Public Instruction - Limited Standard Certification of Public School Personnel

"May be issued to:

1. An applicant who meets all course requirements for the Standard Certificate but who has been out of college ten years or more. Six semester hours of refresher credits will be required of such an applicant for the issuance of the Standard Certificate.

OR

2. An applicant who holds a Delaware Standard Certificate but who has not taught on that certificate for at least three years during the last ten years. Six semester hours of refresher credits will be required of such an applicant for reissuance of the Standard Certificate.

OR

3. An applicant who meets the requirements for the Limited Standard as set forth in the Specific Requirements for any particular certificate. (See Specific Requirements).

OR

4. An applicant with at least a Bachelor's Degree, or a Provisional Certificate-Industrial, who is within nine semester hours of meeting the stated requirements for his certificate as outlined herein and who agrees to remove the deficiencies within the time limit provided he has satisfactorily completed student teaching or one year teaching experience at the appropriate level. The applicant who has been issued a certificate below the limited standard may be issued a limited standard when he has met the conditions of this regulation. In the case of the latter applicant, the total time limitation for meeting the standard requirements is that originally prescribed when the certificate below the limited standard was issued. (This rule does not apply to all certificates, see 3 above and Specific Requirements).

OR

5. An applicant who meets all other requirements but who has not successfully completed clinical and/or field experience including student teachings at the appropriate level. (K-3; Elementary 1-8; Secondary 7-12).

OR

6. An applicant who is a graduate in an approved secondary education program or who holds a valid initial regular certificate in one of the Northeast Compact States. (See Certification Agreements).

OR

7. An applicant who is:

   a. an exchange teacher from a foreign country;

   OR

   b. a teacher in an exchange program organized between states and/or schools and/or institutions of higher education and/or state education agencies within the United States;

   OR

   c. a teacher from a foreign country who holds a valid certificate from that country and a degree equivalent to a Bachelor's degree as defined in the United States.

8. An applicant for a specialized assignment for which no certificate is defined, who possesses the competence and skills required for the special assignment needed in a Delaware school district (example: museum curator, laboratory technician, professional actor). The applicants credentials, including evidence of the skills and competence, will be collected by the employing district and sent to the Delaware State Department of Public Instruction along with a job description of the special assignment. A determination regarding certification will be made by the Delaware State Department of Public Instruction.

All Limited Standard Certificates shall be issued with a time limitation of three years to allow for the completion of the requirements prescribed at the time of the issuance of the certificate. The "requirement" might be a recommendation based on satisfactory experience.

Appendix E (Continued)

A Limited Standard Certificate carries the same salary as a Standard Certificate.

A Limited Standard Certificate is issued only at the request of the employing district.

The Standard Certificate may be issued to replace the Limited Standard when all requirements have been met and the applicant is recommended by the Chief School Officer in the local school district where employed."

Bibliography

Center for Law and Education, Harvard University. Alternative Schools, A Practical Manual. September, 1972.

Center for New Schools. A Quality Schools Network for Illinois, A Report to Dr. Michael J. Bakalis, Superintendent of Public Instruction. December, 1971.

Guthrie, James W. and Edward Wynne, eds. New Models for American Education. Prentice Hall, 1971.

Hansen, Kenneth H. ed. The Governance of State Education Systems: Pressures, Problems, Options. H.E.W., Office of Education, 1972.

Harvard Educational Review. A Special Issue on Alternative Schools. Volume 42, No. 3, August, 1972.

Kozol, Jonathan. Free Schools. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972.

Listokin, David. "Reforming Educational Funding in New Jersey: Implications for Urban and Suburban School Districts." An unpublished paper prepared for the New Jersey State Department of Education.

Martinez, Robert P. and William J. Zaine. What Every School Board Member Should Know About: Basic School Law. New Jersey School Boards Association, 1973.

Morphet and Jesser, eds. "Emerging State Responsibilities for Education," Improving State Leadership in Education. Denver, 1970.

National Alternative Schools Program. Rationale, Readings, Resources. Amherst, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts, School of Education, May, 1973.

New Jersey Education Association. New Jersey Public School Finance Program, 1972-1973. December, 1972.

New Schools - A National Directory of Alternative Schools, October, 1971.

Pincus, John. Incentives for Innovation in the Public Schools. A Draft prepared for NIE Symposium, 1972.

Reisehauer, Robert D. and Robert W. Hartman. Reforming School Finance. Brookings Institution, 1973.

Sussman, Leila. An unpublished paper prepared for the Organization for Educational Cooperation and Development, December, 1971.

"The Changing Role of the Teacher and its Implications, The Role of the Teacher in Selective Innovative Schools in the United States." Note by the Secretariate.

Thereus, John. Financing Public Alternative Schools. Amherst, Massachusetts: National Alternative Schools Program, University of Massachusetts, School of Education.